

REMARKS*Status of the Claims*

Claims 1-20 were in the application as filed.

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,154,463 to Aggarwal, *et al.* (hereinafter, Aggarwal).

Claims 6 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Aggarwal.

Claims 8-20 stand objected to as being dependent on a rejected claim.

By this response, claims 8, 15 and 16 are amended.

Claims 1-20 remain in the application.

Arguments in support of patentability of claims remaining in the application*Rejection of Claims 1-5 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)*

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Aggarwal.

With regard to claim 1, Examiner states that

Aggarwal discloses (Figs 1-17 and col. 1, line 10 to col.25, line 55) a method practiced at a gateway server (Fig 1 2, Ref R1 is multicast session directory server) connected to a Multicast network (Fig 2, the links between the routers) and a Unicast network (Fig 2, a link between host and router) for adapting Multicast sessions on said Multicast network in response to requests by a Unicast client on said Unicast network comprising

It will be readily recognized that the techniques described by Aggarwal are couched in terms of a “conference group Steiner multicast (CSM) protocol.” Conferencing of Unicast content is not part of CSM. See, *e.g.*, col. 4, lines 45-59. In particular, Aggarwal emphasizes that “[t]he CSM protocol allows members of a *multicast group* to easily join or leave the group....” (col. 4, lines 57-58) Unicasting appears to be present in the Aggarwal context primarily as part of a link (tunnel) between multicast routers (col. 6, lines 49-50) or to facilitate communicating control information to set up (multicasting) routers. These contributions do not constitute “adapting Multicast

sessions on said Multicast network in response to requests by a Unicast client on said Unicast network ...,” as recited in applicants’ claim 1.

Thus, it is submitted, Examiner has incorrectly identified links between host and router as a Unicast network. Applicant’s attorney has been unable to identify any reference to a Unicast client or any group of clients as a Unicast group. Hosts H_i are identified in the context of column 7, lines 9-22. There, it is clear that the “[a] discussion group G consists of a set of n applications involved in a *multicast session*. [column 7, lines 10-11, emphasis added.] No Unicast sessions, clients or groups are identified.

Further, the purpose, methods or functions of the Aggarwal description do not involve “adapting Multicast sessions on said Multicast network in response to requests by a Unicast client on said Unicast network.” (Applicants’ claim 1.)

There is, therefore, no teaching in Aggarwal of “supplying said Unicast client with said directory information,” or “receiving a request at the gateway server from said Unicast client,” as in applicants’ claim 1. Each of the hosts shown in FIG. 2 of Aggarwal are connected through a respective Multicast router and each of these hosts is a Multicast client or server.

In short, the purpose, function and method steps of the presently claimed inventive method of claim 1 are not found or suggested in Aggarwal. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over Aggarwal.

Claims 2-5 depend from claim 1, and so include the limitations of claim 1 quoted above. These claims 2-5 are therefore also patentable over Aggarwal.

Claims 6 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Aggarwal. It is said by Examiner that “Aggarwal fails to disclose authenticating said Unicast client before supplying the Unicast client with the directory information” Nevertheless, Examiner states that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention ... to implement a login function” Even if use of a login function would have been obvious, the teachings of Aggarwal would not suggest that this was available to a Unicast client, because Aggarwal was not concerned with, nor did he include functionality or methodology for serving, a Unicast client. So, for this reason, in addition to the reasons given with respect to claims 1-5, it is submitted that

claims 6 and 7 are not taught by, nor suggested to those skilled in the art by, the Aggarwal descriptions.

Claims 8-20, though objected to as depending from a rejected claim, were indicated by the Examiner to be allowable over the art if placed in independent form and if amended to include all of the limitations of the claims from which they depend.

Claims 8-20 have been so amended by this response and are therefore in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-20 remaining in the application, as above amended, overcome or avoid all bases for rejection and are allowable. It is requested that all claims be further examined, found allowable and passed to issue.

Please address all correspondence to: Samuel H. Dworetzky, Esq., AT&T Corp., P.O.Box 4110, Middletown, NJ 07748. Applicants' attorney can be reached at (908) 464-6602.

Respectfully,
D. Shur
A. Zeleznik

Date: March 29, 2005

By William Ryan
William Ryan,

Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 24,434
(908) 464-6602